



**Roskilde
University**

Nine competing definitions of governance, governance networks and meta-governance

Torring, Jacob; Sørensen, Eva; Piel Christensen, Louise

Publication date:
2003

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):
Torring, J., Sørensen, E., & Piel Christensen, L. (Eds.) (2003). *Nine competing definitions of governance, governance networks and meta-governance*. Roskilde Universitet.
http://www.ruc.dk/demnetgov_en/working_papers/

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@kb.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

CENTRE FOR DEMOCRATIC NETWORK GOVERNANCE

WORKING PAPER SERIES

NINE COMPETING DEFINITIONS OF GOVERNANCE, GOVERNANCE NETWORKS AND META-GOVERNANCE

(EDS)
JACOB TORFING
EVA SØRENSEN
LOUISE PIEL CHRISTENSEN

WORKING PAPER 2003:1

CENTRE FOR DEMOCRATIC NETWORK GOVERNANCE
ROSKILDE UNIVERSITY, BUILDING 25, P.O. BOX 260,
DK-4000 ROSKILDE, DENMARK
WWW.DEMNETGOV.RUC.DK
SEPTEMBER 2003

ISBN 87-92063-00-4

ISSN 1902-0058

Author/Title/Year	Jessop, B. (1998): "The rise of governance and the risks of failure. The case of economic development". <i>International Social Science Journal/UNESCO</i> , 1998:155.
Governance	Governance – two closely related, but nested meanings can be identified. First, governance can refer to any mode of co-ordination of independent activities. Among these modes, three are relevant here: the anarchy of exchange, organizational hierarchy, and self-organizing 'heterarchy'. The second, more restricted meaning, is heterarchy (or self-organization) (...). (p. 106)
Governance networks	Forms of governance include self-organizing interpersonal networks, negotiated inter-organizational co-ordination, and decentred, context-mediated inter-systemic steering. The latter two cases involve self-organized steering of multiple agencies, institutions, and systems which are operationally autonomous from another yet structurally coupled due to their mutual interdependence. (p. 106.) Networks is seen as a specific form of self-governing. The primary co-ordination instruments in the Keynesian welfare system were the market and the state – articulated in a 'mixed economy'. In the emerging Schumpeterian workfare regime, the market, the national state, and the mixed economy have lost significance to inter-firm networks, public-private partnerships, and a multilateral and heterarchic 'negotiated economy'. (p. 112)
Meta-governance	Meta-governance: 'the organization of self-organization'. This idea should not be confused with a super-ordinate level of government to which all governance arrangements are subordinated. It involves instead the design of institutions and generation of visions which can facilitate not only self-organization in different fields but also the relative coherence of the diverse objectives, spatial and temporal horizons, actions, and outcomes of various self-organizing arrangements. Metagovernance has institutional and strategic dimensions. Institutionally, it provides mechanisms for collective learning about the functional linkages and the material interdependencies among different sites and spheres of action. Strategically, it promotes the development of shared visions which might encourage new institutional arrangements and/or new activities to be pursued to supplement and/or complement existing patterns of governance. (p. 119) This emerging meta-governance role [for the state] means that networking, negotiation, noise reduction, and negative co-ordination takes place 'in the shadow of hierarchy' (from Scharpf, 1994). (p. 120)

Author/Title/Year	Dean, M. (1999): <i>Governmentality. Power and Rule in Modern Society</i> . London: SAGE Publications.
Governance	“(…) that advanced liberal government endeavours not only to work through the various forms of freedom and agency of individuals and collectives but also to deploy indirect means for the surveillance and regulation of that agency. Advanced liberal practices are thus reflexive to the extent that they are concerned to promote and then govern through forms of ‘indigenous government’ of individuals, organizations and collectives (O’Malley, 1998).” (p. 149)
Governance networks	“Government is any more or less calculated and rational activity, undertaken by a multiplicity of authorities and agencies, employing a variety of techniques and forms of knowledge, that seeks to shape conduct by working through our desires, aspirations, interests and beliefs, for definite but shifting ends and with a diverse set of relatively unpredictable consequences, effects and outcomes.” (p. 11)
Meta-governance	“Advanced liberal practices of rule are ‘practices of liberty’ in the sense that they continually associate and dissociate subjection and subjectification, domination and the fabrication of subjectivities. On the one hand they contract, consult, negotiate, create partnerships, even empower and activate forms of agency, liberty and the choices of individuals, consumers, professionals, households, neighbourhoods and communities. On the other, they set norms standards, benchmarks, performance indicators, quality controls and best practice standards, to monitor, measure and render calculable the performance of these various agencies.” (p. 165)

Author/Title/Year	Kickert, Klijn & Koppenjan (1997): "Introduction: A Management Perspective on Policy Network", in Kickert, Klijn & Koppenjan (eds): <i>Managing Complex Networks</i> , London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
Governance	Governance can roughly be described as 'directed influence of social processes'. It covers all kinds of guidance mechanisms which are connected with public policy processes. This means that these forms of guidance are not restricted to conscious or deliberate forms of guidance. In society, self-steering mechanisms exist which ensure that policy processes proceed smoothly. Nor is governance restricted to public actors. All kinds of actors are involved in governance, if only because government does not perform all the governing itself. A wide variety of actions from different actors has consequences for governance. (p. 2)
Governance networks	<p>The concept 'policy network' connects public choices with their strategic and institutionalized context: the network of public, semi-public, and private actors participating in certain policy fields. (p. 1)</p> <p>The network approach considers public policy making and governance to take place in networks consisting of various actors (individuals, coalitions, bureau, organizations) none of which possesses the power to determine the strategies of the other actors. The government is no longer seen as occupying a superior position to other parties, but as being on equal footing with them. Public policy making within networks is about cooperation or non-cooperation between interdependent parties with different and often conflicting rationalities, interests and strategies. Policy processes are not viewed as the implementation of ex ante formulated goals, but as an interaction process in which actors exchange information about problems, preferences and means, and trade off goals and resources. Improving the conditions for collective actions can be done by network management: the management of the interaction processes within networks or the changing of the structural and cultural characteristics of the network. (p. 9)</p>
Meta-governance	The potentials of policy networks for problem resolution and governmental steering is examined (...) by elaborating the idea of network management. Network management is an example of governance and public management in situations of interdependencies. It is aimed at coordinating strategies of actors with different goals and preferences with regard to a certain problem or policy measure within an existing network of interorganizational relations. Network management aims at initiating and facilitating interaction processes between actors, creating and changing network arrangements for better coordination. (pp. 10-11)

Author/Title/Year	Kooimann, J. (1993), "Social-Political Governance: Introduction" in Kooimann, J. (ed.): <i>Modern Governance</i> , London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
Governance	In terms of working definitions: by governing we mean all those activities of social, political and administrative actors that can be seen as purposeful efforts to guide, steer, control or manage (sector or facets of) societies. To distinguish these new or modern interactive forms from other, we call them social-political governing and governance in this study. Social-political forms of governing are forms of governing in which public or private actors do not act separately but in conjunction, together, in combination, that is to say in 'co' arrangements. The interactive aspects of these forms are quite important. By 'governance' we mean the patterns that emerge from governing activities of social, political and administrative actors. These patterns form the 'emerging' outcome as well as a more abstract (higher level) framework for day-to-day efforts at governing. Modes of social-political governance are always an outcome of public and private interaction. Interactive social-political governance means setting the tone; creating the social-political conditions for the development of new models of interactive governing in terms of co-management, co-steering and co-guidance. (pp. 2-3)
Governance networks	Social-political governance and governing are not primarily looked upon as acts of governments, but as more or less continuous processes of interaction between social actors, groups and forces and public or semi public organizations, institutions or authorities. There is a division of labour between them, which may shift during the interaction. (pp. 2-3)
Meta-governance	New patterns of interaction between government and society can be observed in areas such as social welfare, environmental protection, education and physical planning. These new patterns are apparently aimed at discovering other ways of coping with new problems or of creating new possibilities for governing. The discussion about new patterns of interaction between government and society takes place on two (analytically) distinguishable levels. On a concrete governing level there is the search for new models of governing in terms of 'co' such as co-steering, co-managing, co-producing and co-allocating. But one can also observe changes in terms of patterns of governance: broader and maybe more pervasive efforts to come to grips with fundamental developments and structural characteristics of the societies we live in. These are what we would like to call changes taking place on the governance level (or even meta-governance level). (p. 2)

Author/Title/Year	March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1995), <i>Democratic Governance</i> , New York: The Free Press.
Governance	By emphasizing the arrangement of Pareto-improving coalitions and policies, exchange theories tend to lose sight of those aspects of governance that focus on the development and transformation of constraints, on the ways the rights, rules, preferences, and resources that structure political outcomes are created, sustained, and reformed. (p. 26)
Governance networks	Like earlier political systems, contemporary democratic polities seem to be collections of loosely coupled institutional spheres with different purposes, logics, principles, and dynamics. They involve relatively stable, self-organizing networks of interdependent but partly autonomous actors with resource bases and rule structures of their own. (p. 70)
Meta-governance	From an institutional perspective the craft of governance is organized around four tasks: 1) Governance involves developing identities of citizens and groups in the political environment. Preferences, expectations, beliefs, identities, and interest are not exogenous to political history. They are created and changed within that history. 2) Governance involves developing capabilities for appropriate political action among citizens, groups, and institutions. Democracy requires that political actors act in ways that are consistent with and sustain the democratic system, fulfilling the expectations of the relevant rules, norms, and duties, and adapting them to changing experience. 3) Governance involves developing accounts of political events. Meanings and histories are socially constructed. Political myths are developed and transmitted. Accounts of what has happened, why it happened, and how events should be evaluated provide a key link between citizens and government. 4) Governance involves developing an adaptive political system, one that copes with changing demands and changing environments. (pp. 45-46)

Author/Title/Year	Milward, H. Brinton & Keith G. Provan (2000): "How Networks Are Governed" in Heinrich & Lynn (eds): <i>Governance and Performance: new perspectives</i> , Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
Governance	Governance is a more inclusive term [than government] concerned with creating the conditions for ordered rule and collective action, often including agents in the private sector. The essence of governance is its focus on governing mechanisms (grants, contracts, agreements) that do not rest solely on the authority and sanctions of government. These mechanisms, or tools, are used to connect networks of actors, who operate in various domains of public policy such as welfare, health, or transportation. A critical empirical question is the degree to which they operate autonomously or are steered by the state. (p. 239)
Governance networks	A variety of government agencies have chosen to share their authority for collective action with non-profit agencies and private firms in a network of mutual dependence – governments have chosen networks of providers to deliver taxpayer funded services. (p. 239) The fact that a hollow state relies on networks is a weakness as well as a strength. Because of hierarchy, bureaucracies are more predictable and stable over time. Networks – the mainstay of the hollow state – are inherently weaker forms of social action. Because they must coordinate production jointly, networks are inherently unstable over time. (p. 241)
Meta-governance	<p>The title of the paper: "How networks are governed".</p> <p>To put it brief: The government performs meta-governance by steering rather than rowing – through contracts.</p> <p>Governance as supplying collective services to citizens through various tools, government provision being only one of them. Thus tools such as contracts, quasi markets, and franchises allow the government to 'steer rather than row' (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). What is so astonishing about this worldwide movement away from government provision and toward government procurement is that there is little evidence that central government know very much about how to govern or manage networks. (p. 239-240)</p> <p>Two elements are key to the definition of the hollow state: joint production and having several degrees of separation between the source and the user of government funds. Both elements combine to ensure that hierarchies and markets will not work and that networks are the only alternative for collective action. (p. 243)</p> <p>Network governance is concerned with how control is maintained over the set of contracts that govern the provision of a set of services. (p. 244)</p>

Author/Title/Year	Peters, B.G. and Pierre, J. (2000), <i>Governance, Politics and the State</i> , Basingstoke: Macmillan.
Governance	<p>Governance is a messy term – an umbrella concept. The reason for its popularity is its capacity to – unlike that of the narrower term ‘government’ – to cover the whole range of institutions and relationships involved in the process of governing. Governance as a concept links the political system with its environment in the governing of society. Thinking about governance means thinking about how to steer the economy and society, and how to reach collective goals. (p. 1) (...) we look at governance as processes in which the state plays a leading role, making priorities and defining objectives. (p. 12) Here we will discuss governance as structure and process. 1) Governance as institutional structures: four common governance arrangements that have existed historically as well as at present: hierarchies, markets, networks and communities. 2) Governance as the processes of steering and coordination. Focus is on outcome. (p. 14 ff)</p>
Governance networks	<p>Most familiar form contemporary governance is policy networks. Such networks comprise a wide variety of actors – state institutions, organized interests etc. in a given policy sector. Networks vary from coherent policy communities to single-issue coalitions. Networks facilitate coordination of public and private interests and resources and, in that respect, enhance efficiency in the implementation of public policy. Networks in the ‘new governance’ thus regulate and coordinate policy sectors more according to the preferences of the actors involved than with consideration to public policy. From the point of view of the state, networks embody considerable expertise and interest representation and hence are potentially valuable components in the policy process. However, networks are held together by common interests which tend to challenge the interests of the state. (pp. 19-20)</p>
Meta-governance	<p>We see governance as the articulation and pursuit of collective interests in the “post-strong state” era. (...) That having been said, however, governing the state and society is still a highly politically charged process and, we argue, the state remains the only creature in society that can play that political – and democratic – role. (pp. 12-13) Governance as institutional structures - emphasizes the impact of structures and institutions. The assumption is that if you want to get governance ‘right’ you need to manipulate the structures within which it is presumed to be generated. The alternative assumption is that governance is a dynamic outcome of social and political actors and therefore if changes are demanded then it is those dynamics that should be addressed. Meta-governance: steering and coordinating. (pp. 22-23)</p>

Author/Title/Year	Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997), <i>Understanding Governance – Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability</i> , Buckingham/Philadelphia: Open University Press.
Governance	“The term ‘governance’ refers to a change in the meaning of government, referring to a <i>new</i> process of governing. <i>Governance refers to self-organizing, interorganizational networks</i> characterized by interdependence, resource exchange, rules of the game and significant autonomy from the state.” (p. 15)
Governance networks	Rhodes (1986) defines a policy network as a cluster or complex of organizations connected to one another by resource dependencies, but elaborates this definition by distinguishing between five types of networks ranging along a continuum from tightly integrated policy communities to loosely integrated issue networks. These networks are also distinguished by their membership in the distribution of resources between members. The model conflates two separate dimensions. Policy networks differ according to their integration, stability and exclusiveness; the distinction between policy community and issue networks is common in the literature. However, networks also differ according to which interest dominates them. Professional interests, economic interests or government may dominate a network but the model suggests there cannot be a professional-, or producer-, dominated <i>policy community</i> . (pp. 37-39)
Meta-governance	By fragmenting Britain’s institutional structure, the government created service delivery networks with two distinctive features. First, the membership of networks became broader, incorporating both the private and voluntary sectors. Second, the government swapped direct for indirect controls. Central departments are no longer either necessarily or invariably the fulcrum, or focal organization, of a network. Power relations may remain asymmetric. The government can set parameters to network actions. It still funds the services. However, it has also increased its dependence on multifarious networks. (p. 12)

Author/Title/Year	Scharpf, F. W. (1994): 'Games Real Actors Could Play. Positive and negative coordination in embedded negotiations', <i>Journal of Theoretical Politics</i> , vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 27-53.
Governance	Roughly: Governance = Coordination. Coordinated action in the sense used here depends on specific and contingent attitudinal or institutional mechanisms of 'coordination', concertation or 'governance'. (p. 28)
Governance networks	Roughly: Networks = Horizontal negotiated coordination. 'Relational contracts' may be described as a characteristic form of interactions within 'networks'. (p. 28) Self-coordination in networks – self-organizing networks of high-trust relationships may in fact serve some of the functions ascribed to hierarchical structures. (p. 40)
Meta-governances	The importance of hierarchy – hierarchical structures, even though incapable of achieving effective hierarchical coordination, nevertheless define the context within which negotiations must take place. (p. 40) Meta-governance: negotiations under the shadow of hierarchy. In most western democracies the unilateral exercise of state authority has largely been replaced by formal or informal negotiations, in policy formation as well as in policy implementation between governmental actors and the affected individuals and organizations. At the same time, important areas of public concern are shaped by negotiations within pluralist or corporatist 'policy communities' or 'policy networks'. While the former pattern seems to correspond to the vertical 'dialogue model', the latter has all the appearances of horizontal self-coordination. But in both dimensions, these are typically negotiations under the shadow of hierarchical authority. Self-coordination in networks: coordination without hierarchy. (p. 41)